



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

nationalized except the post. Inter-racial geography has become a recognized science, and medicine is taking the intermixtures of peoples as a basis for new investigations and deductions. National transference is argued as an offset to race decadence and even race suicide.

The international mind is certainly growing, and bound to dictate future policies the world over. Such an empire as the British, which has the most diverse peoples to assimilate and the most scattered complexities to handle, must reach out into the international mind for sufficient wisdom.

What has been brought together through the accidents of quick communion and the *Zeitgeist*, entangling race with race, will demand, and forthwith out of itself produce, an inter-consciousness also. It will also produce leaders composite enough to deal with the needs.

We must, both as individuals and as nations, enter into the recognition of this international mind and seek to realize what it means and what it can do to assist us in the broader life which each single State and each individual must draw out of the composite.

Race prejudice is the bane of every nationalizing energy. The nation, in order to exist, must attempt to centralize and unify. Race prejudice is purely centrifugal, and it must be overcome, or it is a danger to the "center of rest," which is the life of the family, the home, State, and individual.

Warring internal elements are even more ravaging than external wars. To avoid both these, conglomerate nations must seek to inculcate international-mindedness in their leaders as well as their peoples. To gain this concept we must learn to measure each group from the point of view of their own standard rather than from one outside and foreign to them.

We shall never be able to explain away the vast differences which make races so diametrically opposite in their ideas, standards, culture—but we must realize these differences as valuable, and be glad that they exist for the sake of their peculiar contribution to the whole.

As one feels regret to see the lovely (and oft unlovely) customs and costumes of the provinces disappear, so we might almost regret to feel that this amalgamating process is going to rob us of the manifold facets of the solitaire of civilization, each of which adds its scintillations to the intensive whole.

The internationalist holds that there is a place in the world for the peculiar contribution of all these races and sub-races. The one vital question we must answer is how are we going to bring about the consciousness which will allow all these diverging elements to live and to let live—to keep them from hampering and hindering one another, from criticising and ridiculing back and forth, and help them to live together as fellow-partakers in the vast good which is bound to come to each when civilization declares her dividends.

Of course time will do all this; but that is the very argument which should make us all eager to have it realized in the now, instead of stupidly awaiting the disintegrations of time. If we have a marble structure to build, we do not wait for frost and thaw and accident to cut our blocks, as it cuts the caves for the cavern-dwellers. We hew our building material with every device of art and science and get the result on exact calculations.

We have in the same way the inevitable structure of

an international whole to upbuild—time is bound to do it in his stately eons—but why not, as wise citizens, as statesmen, as idealists and prophets, all hands together, carve out this ornate structure of intermingled concepts, this race architecture, where every part is the vital contribution produced by another type and kind and contributed in its actual entity and entirety?

Our "music of the future" will not only be a full combination of the arts and sciences, but of the heart-throbs as well, and its commingling chords of radiant energy will really be a harmonious whole—a compositely unified humanity. The large, calm chorus of the sane citizen who wishes a settled progressive state to exist must learn to sing something broader than a three-colored patriotism inside his commercial citadels as well as on the international highway. He must know that there is a keen interdependence in his foreign as well as his domestic relationships. He must be willing to lift the political discussions of the fireside up into the light of outer-world necessities. He must learn to see men as individuals not as English, German, Italian, French. He must see brotherhood as a principle of business and religion, not as a far-off, never-to-be-realized sentiment.

All our burning questions—social, financial, domestic—will come into a new light by this process of internationalization, and who knows but we may through it find a clearer solution and a more acceptable remedy than any set of reformers can now devise who are looking through the narrow spectacles of any one race.

Human progress cannot be forever blockaded. This very mingling of the nations will be the disintegrating factor which will dissolve the cement of time-honored prejudices—through which prejudices alone the exploiters of the public weal can work.

Eugenically we will discover that we must sanitize the whole world if we would preserve ourselves, and work for the big general good if we would preserve our own little good. What we are bound to amalgamate with and assimilate we will first purify, lest it destroy us. So the international necessity which is being heaped upon us will compel us to perfect our brother man.

We are already international; now let us live up to it.

(Concluded next month.)

## The Present Demands of the Peace Movement.

By Benjamin F. Trueblood.

Address delivered at the St. Louis Peace Congress, May 2, 1913.

The peace movement in its organized form is now nearing its hundredth anniversary. The century covered by it has been, from the pacifist point of view, one of extraordinary significance, the full force of which it is not easy to state. From three societies, small and little known, in 1815, the movement has grown till now the peace organizations throughout the world number more than six hundred, several of them of national scope, and new ones are coming into existence continually. These organizations, devoted exclusively to the one great end, are closely affiliated in an International Congress which meets annually in leading cities, and in a Permanent Peace Bureau at Berne, whose governing board is composed of thirty-five prominent pacifists

from different nations. The literature of the movement—papers, pamphlets, books—of which there was scarcely a pocketful a hundred years ago, has grown until at the present time it would take a good-sized library to hold it. A union of pacifist members of parliaments has come into existence in the last two decades with more than three thousand members, whose conferences, like the peace congresses, are held under the auspices of the governments in whose domains they meet.

Since the rise of the peace movement, in 1815, and in considerable measure in response to the pressure which it has brought to bear, the principle of arbitration has been applied to the adjustment of international controversies until it has become in our day the regular practice of the governments to settle their differences in this way, instead of plunging into war over them. The century record of three hundred and more important cases of settlement by this method constitutes one of the most luminous pages of history. The century began with war the rule, and no exceptions; it ends with arbitration the rule, and war the exception.

Two Governmental Peace Conferences have been held at The Hague, participated in by all the important nations of the world. Through these conferences a Permanent International Court of Arbitration has been set up and successfully employed for more than a decade in the settlement of controversies—a dozen of them. An agreement among the nations has been reached that the Hague International Peace Conference shall meet periodically hereafter—the beginning of a world parliament. The regular International Court of Justice has in principle been unanimously approved by the governments, and only waits for the discovery of a practical method of selecting the judges to be put into operation. Treaties of arbitration, limited in scope, have been concluded among all the important governments and serve as a strong bulwark against the outbreak of war.

These great accomplishments, not to go further into detail, are sufficient proof that the peace movement is an eminently practical as well as an absolutely imperative one, and that its founders and early apostles did not go beyond reason and good sense in conceiving that such a system of good-will and law might be established among the nations as would banish the horrid system of war from the earth.

Toward that great end the processes of our civilization are now clearly seen to be moving. The peoples of the different advanced nations—the rank and file of them in large numbers—the working classes, the socialist groups, the business men, the intellectuals in considerable measure, have got it into their heads that war is no longer a necessity in our time, that no excuse remains for it, and that the huge preparations for warfare on land and sea which are consuming the meager resources of "men and workers" are not only needless, but positively criminal.

In view of the remarkable progress which has thus been made toward realizing the great purpose of the world-peace movement and of the extraordinary change which a century has wrought in public opinion in regard to war; in view also of the leading part taken by our country, both privately and governmentally, in the movement, the question naturally arises what phases

of the subject should the peace party, especially in the United States, keep to the front, emphasize, and push with all energy at the present time? Let me sketch in a few brief statements what both opportunity and duty demand of us—the very least that we can do and be loyal to the great principles and policies which we have espoused and which we have gathered in this Congress to promote:

1. First of all, we must put forth more earnest and constant effort to bring the people—all the people, all kinds of people—over to our side. This is fundamental. The cause is the peoples' cause. It is they who suffer most from war and on whom the burdens of the current colossal preparations for war press most ruinously. They are fast learning this. They do not so much need convincement; they need gathering and organizing. They are sound at heart for the most part; sounder than some loud-mouthed pacifists who are for peace today and for war tomorrow. They must be given a chance to understand the full meaning of the peace movement to themselves, and to express themselves fully and clearly. When the people are by our sides, and only when they are by our sides, will the peace movement enter victoriously upon its final stage. It will take money to do this work, much more than is now at our disposal, even since the munificent Carnegie and Ginn Fountains were established. The price of two or three of the latest battleships would do it. Somebody must give this money; somebody will give it.

2. In the next place, we must urge, in season and out of season, that all controversies between nations not susceptible of adjustment by direct negotiation shall be submitted to the Court of Arbitration at The Hague, which the governments of the world have solemnly set up for this very purpose, or to other tribunals which it may be found advisable to create at the moment. We have already heard too much about "national honor" and "vital interests" and hair-splitting distinctions between justiciable and non-justiciable disputes. Are we not trying to conceal a secret hankering after "war and pillage" every time we use one of these vague and indefinable terms? There are no unarbitrable controversies in our day between nations whose independence is mutually recognized.

A great step in the direction of the establishment of a system of unrestricted arbitration of disputes just failed of being taken last summer when the Senate, by only a single majority vote, so amended the treaties with Great Britain and France that the heart was taken out of them. The country was with President Taft in favor of the treaties, as the Senators' desks piled high—some of them vexatiously high—day after day with letters and telegrams bore unmistakable witness. Every effort must be made to have similar treaties of unlimited scope, somewhat simpler in form possibly, concluded as speedily as practical not only with Great Britain and France, but also with Germany and all other powers which may be willing to join with us. Limited treaties of arbitration, of which our country has had twenty-four for the last five years, which are being renewed this spring as they expire, are good as far as they go. But they do not meet the demands of the present. We have moved up a good many paces since these treaties were signed in the spring of 1908. When the new Administration takes up this matter, as

it is expected to do at an early date, every possible influence must be brought to bear to make it uncomfortable for any Senator to oppose the new treaties.

3. Not the least of our forces should be directed this year and next to bringing every influence to bear upon all the powers to make the next Hague Conference, to be held two years hence, as potent as possible in carrying forward the judicial and political organization of the world for perpetual peace. The general treaty of obligatory arbitration to be signed by all the nations jointly, which failed of adoption in 1907 for lack of unanimity, though it carried the support through their representatives at The Hague of nearly the whole population and territory of the globe, must not be allowed to fail again. We may reasonably expect, also, that if the friends of peace bestir themselves and make their power felt, the Third Hague Conference will devise a method of selecting judges for the International High Court of Justice which was voted in principle in 1907, and thus complete this supremely important step in the progress of world order and peace.

Not to specify further the important things of secondary order with which the coming Hague Conference should be asked to deal effectively, let me devote the remainder of my time to the most urgent of all the international peace problems of our day—that of an arrest of the current rivalry in armaments.

4. The question of limitation and reduction of armaments and the attending budgets of expense, like the famous ghost of Banquo, will not down. It is more thought about, talked about, and written about, pro and con, than any other international question. The Czar of Russia in 1898 placed the subject foremost in his rescript urging the necessity of an international conference. The First Hague Conference adopted a resolution urging upon the governments the study of the subject with a view to finding relief for the peoples from the excessive burdens laid upon them by the great armaments. The Second Hague Conference unanimously voted again the recommendation with greater emphasis than was given in 1899. Not long ago the Prime Minister of England declared the present rivalry in armaments, at such enormous cost, to be a satire on civilization. The heads of a number of governments, and especially the chancellors of various exchequers who annually rack their brains to find new sources of revenue, have declared their intense dissatisfaction with the situation and their readiness to limit and reduce armaments if other powers will do the same. But so far nothing has been done. No effort has been made to carry out the recommendations of the Hague conferences. No government has had the sense or the courage even to propose seriously the study of the question by all the governments. But suspicion and fear, charge and counter-charge of evil designs, imaginings of pending invasion by sea and air have continued to prevail and the armaments and war budgets to pile up to mountainous proportions. Just now Germany has had a fresh attack of shivers over the Balkan military successes and the increased prominence into which the Slavs have thus been brought, and has decided to increase her great army from over 600,000 to above 800,000 men and to add several new dreadnaughts to her navy. France sniffs the east wind, and votes to increase her army and navy in the same proportion. Great Britain groans,

and votes to lay down five new dreadnaughts. Russia growls, and orders the creation of three new army corps, and so on. All sense of economy and of the crushing burdens laid on the taxpayers is thrown to the winds and a new stage of the race to the abyss of destruction has commenced. Has Europe gone stark mad?

Here, then, is the immediate, unescapable task of our peace organizations. If we have any faith, any courage, we will undertake the attack at once. The barrier of the big and ever-growing armaments lies directly across our path. Little more can be done until it is broken down. It is in the way of the completion of nearly every constructive measure that we have in hand. The powers who have the biggest armaments and depend upon them for safety and honor will not go the whole length in the creation of pacific institutions through which force is relegated to the background. It was the biggest army and the biggest navy of the world that defeated two of the most prominent propositions at the Second Hague Conference.

In spite, however, of the general darkness and hopelessness of the situation, a ray of light has sprung up in our own Capital. It is universally conceded and no longer needs to be argued that our country is most favorably situated to take the lead in the solution of this difficult problem. The solution has indeed already begun. Congress for two successive years has refused, the second time in spite of the enormous pressure brought to bear upon it by the new Navy League, to make appropriations for more than one new battleship annually; in other words, has arrested, temporarily at least, the growth of the navy, for the new ship annually just makes up for an old one going out of commission. This position taken by the national legislature, in response, I am sure, to the wish of the people, should have the instant and unequivocal support of all pacifists, regardless of party affiliations. Besides this, our Government must be led to feel that the United States, from its character and geographical situation, is under peculiar obligation to take up immediately with the other powers the question of a general agreement for both the limitation and the reduction of armaments. The time is over-ripe for our civilization, if it does not wish to perish in such a cataclysm as the world never saw, to unload this monstrous burden which cripples and disgraces it. And the Third Hague Conference must not be allowed to pass without the accomplishment of what everybody longs to see done.

### No More Battleships Needed.

From the speech of Hon. S. A. Witherspoon, of Mississippi, in the House of Representatives, Saturday, February 22, 1913.

(Concluded from April.)

And I call your attention to the position of the highest authority on naval affairs in this House, the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Padgett], who said, in his speech to the House in 1908, that he protested against adding four more battleships to our Navy, and he declared on the floor of the House that the Navy as it then existed was magnificent. Since that time we have added nine dreadnaughts to the Navy, and if it was magnificent then, I defy any member of this House to suggest an adjective that will accurately describe it now.